

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Patent Application of

Confirmation No.: 5069

Yiu Ming CHEUNG et al.

Date: September 24, 2008

Serial No.: 10/628,503

Group Art Unit: 2823

Filed: July 28, 2003

Examiner: COLEMAN, William D.

For: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR THIN DIE DETACHMENT

VIA EFS-WEB

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §41.41

Sir:

This Reply Brief is in response to the Examiner's Answer dated July 29, 2008.

The Examiner has essentially repeated the final rejection in his Answer; the only additional insight into the grounds for the rejection appear in his Response to Argument beginning on page 9. Even this, however, isn't particularly helpful, since the Examiner continues to ignore the fact that neither reference says anything about initiating detachment of the die from the tape by mechanical contact "substantially at the corners".

The Examiner talks about the fact that the word "substantially" is purportedly broad enough to refer to the number of pins, or can be taken to mean "somewhat near the corners". What he fails to address, however, is that Nishiguchi explicitly teaches initiating detachment by radiation, while the claims herein call for mechanical initiation by contact of the tape by the pins. That is, not only does Nishiguchi fail to disclose that the pins 6a-6d of Nishiguchi are "operative to initiate detachment of a die from the film by contacting the film . . . substantially at *the corners* of the die . . .", as recited in claim 21, for example, Nishiguchi explicitly teaches away from including this feature. He also ignores the fact that pins 17 shown in Kurosawa's prior art Figure 3C are clearly not substantially at the corners, however broadly the word "substantially" is interpreted. Nor does

he address the fact that he admitted this during an interview with applicants' representative, as stated at page 11 of Applicant's previously filed Appeal Brief .

In this context, it should be noted that terminology such as "substantially" can be acceptably definite if "one of ordinary skill in the art would understand what is claimed, in light of the specification" *See: M.P.E.P § 2173.05(b)*. This section goes on to state:

When a term of degree is presented in a claim, first a determination is to be made as to whether the specification provides some standard for measuring that degree. If it does not, a determination is made as to whether one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the prior art and the status of the art, would be nevertheless reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Here, the specification, at page 6, line 12 through page 7, line 26, provides a detailed exposition of how the term "substantially" is to be interpreted. Moreover, one skilled in the art would clearly understand that "substantially" is intended to be interpreted functionally, i.e., close enough to accomplish the disclosed purpose.


Further in this context, it should be noted that there is no rejection here under 35 U.S.C. 112. Nor, given the details disclosed as cited above, could there properly be such a rejection.

When all is said and done, the fact remains that neither reference teaches initiation of detachment by pins acting "substantially" at the corners, when that term is properly interpreted in light of the specification, and on the basis of a reasonable understanding of a person skilled in the art.

For the foregoing additional reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the final rejection should be reversed and this application passed to issue.

I THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING
SYSTEM ON September 24, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Faber

Registration No.: 24,322

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF/KJB